

OFFICIAL 2001

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 16 2004

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 10/067,185 Confirmation No. 5257  
Applicant : Thomas D. Johnson  
Filed : February 1, 2002  
TG/A.U. : 1651  
Examiner : Leon B. Lankford  
Docket No. : 02-0201-JOHN  
Customer No. : 26357

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

NUMBER OF PAGES: 4 (Includes this page)

## Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax. No. 703-872-9306 on January 16, 2004

Typed name of person signing this certificate: Robert M. Hunter

Signature: Robert M. Hunter 42,679

Appl. No. 10/067,185

Related to Office action of December 16, 2003

**NOTIFICATION OF INCOMPLETE OFFICE ACTION**

Pursuant to MPEP 710.06, applicant hereby respectfully calls to the attention of the Office that the Office action mailed on 12/16/03 is incomplete because it does not specify which claims are considered by the Examiner to be linking claims. MPEP 809.03 requires that "Where linking claims exist, a letter including a restriction requirement . . . will be effected, specifying which claims are considered to be linking."

The applicant has proposed that claims 7, 8, 13-19, 29-32, 40-44 are linking claims. These claims link the claims in Group I to those in Groups II, IV, V, VI, VIII and IX. Groups II and IV include claims to compositions and, as such are not covered by the guidance in 1184 O.G. 86. MPEP 809.04 requires that "If a linking claim is allowed, the examiner must thereafter examine species if the linking claim is generic thereto, or he or she must examine the claims to the nonelected inventions that are linked to the elected invention by such allowed linking claim."

Without a statement in the record that the Examiner agrees that claims 7, 8, 13-19, 29-32, 40-44 are linking claims, applicant cannot be assured that the claims of the linked groups will be examined if a linking claim is allowed. Furthermore, MPEP 808 requires that "The linking

claims must be examined with the invention elected, and should any linking claim be allowed, the restriction requirement must be withdrawn." Unless the Examiner plans to issue more than two Office actions, the findings of the examination of the linking claims should have been presented in the first Office action.

The Office action mailed on 12/16/03 does not state in which group or groups new claims 40-44 have been placed. Claim 43 is to a composition and, as such, is not covered by the guidance in 1184 O.G. 86. The applicant needs to know in which group(s) these claims have been placed so that they can be assured that they are in groups containing claims that will be examined if the linking claims are allowed.

Claims 7, 13, 14, 16, 18 and 42 depend from Group I claim 1 and by such dependence contains all of the limitations of claim 1. Claim 8 depends from claim 7. Claims also depend from Group I claim 1. Claim 15 depends from claim 14. Claim 17 depends from claim 16. Claim 19 depends from claim 18. Claims 29 and 41 depends from Group I claim 23. Claims 30-32 depend from claim 29. Claim 40 depends from Group I claim 22.

Applicant understands that all the process claims that depend from an allowed product

claim or include the limitations of a process claim will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability at the time of the allowance of the product claim, in accordance with the guidance in 1184 O.G. 86.

Page 3 of 3

A supplemental Office action stating in which group(s) claims 40-44 have been placed and which claims are linking claims, giving reasons for the allowance or rejection of at least the composition linking claims is, therefore, respectfully requested. In accordance with MPEP 710.06, applicant also hereby requests that the response period be reset because this notice is being filed within one month of the mailing date of the Office action containing the error.

Applicant respectfully requests that the supplemental Office action be mailed as soon as possible because it appears that a petition on the linking claims issue must be filed by 02/16/04, which is two months after the date of the Office action. Applicants understand that any petition related to the restriction requirement (which is another issue) can be delayed.



ROBERT M. HUNTER PLLC

By: Robert M. Hunter

Robert M. Hunter  
Reg. No. 42,679  
Tel.: (808) 885-4194

Page 4 of 4